



California Energy Commission

Integrated Energy Policy Report Workshop Procurement Review Groups in Utility Procurement

July 14, 2008 - 10 a.m.

Call-In Number: 1-888-566-5914, Passcode: IEPR , Call Leader: Suzanne Korosec

AGENDA

Introduction – Suzanne Korosec, IEPR Lead

Opening Comments – IEPR Committee

Commissioner Jeffrey Byron

Chairman Jackalyne Pfannenstiel

Overview of PRG Roles and Responsibilities

David Vidaver, CEC Staff

Presentations/Discussion

- Simon Baker, CPUC
- Colin Cushnie, SCE
- Valerie Winn, PG&E
- Mike McClenahan, SDG&E
- Mike Florio, TURN
- Sepideh Khosrowjah, DRA
- Alan Taylor, Sedway Consulting (via telephone)
- Steven Kelly, IEP
- Jane Turnbull, League of Women Voters
- Nora Sheriff, Cogeneration Association of California/Energy Producers and Users Coalition
- Dorothy Rothrock, California Manufacturers and Technology Association

Public Comments

Closing comments: IEPR Committee

Adjourn

Questions for Panelists:

1. How do the utilities decide what subjects to bring up with the Procurement Review Groups? To what extent do discussions include items that are not specifically required by the CPUC to be presented to the PRG?
2. The PRGs were originally established as an interim measure to speed up evaluation of utility procurement requests. How has that role evolved over time, and what is the current role played by the PRGs in the resource planning and procurement processes?
3. How well are the PRGs serving the purpose(s) for which they were created and for which they are currently being used?
4. Are there unique characteristics of the planning and procurement process in California that might require more confidentiality here than in other states?
5. Does the current set of information that is held to be confidential in planning and procurement settings adequately and accurately balance the need to protect market-sensitive data with the need to protect the public interest in securing efficient outcomes? Is there information that is held confidential that should be made public? If so, why, and if not, why is it confidential?
6. Are there alternatives to the PRGs for considering confidential material that would serve the public interest equally or more effectively? That would provide greater transparency? If not, are there steps that can be taken to increase the transparency of PRG activities within the existing framework?
7. What effect has the inclusion of an Independent Evaluator had on the PRG process? Are there additional steps that should be taken beyond those outlined in CPUC Decision 04-12-048 and subsequent CPUC decisions to guarantee outcomes that are fair? In general, how might the PRG process be modified to increase confidence in its contribution to the decision-making process?
8. The successes and failures of the procurement process are frequently obscured by confidentiality concerns. For example, broad claims have been made by utilities regarding both the low costs of renewables relative to the Market Price Referent, and the high costs of renewables relative to other resources. These claims have not been and cannot be verified by other parties in a public setting. How can such developments be brought to the attention of both the public and policymakers without divulging confidential information from the PRGs, yet still provide adequate data upon which to base conclusions and decisions?
9. How can public discussion of significant issues that first surface in the PRGs take place without violating confidentiality considerations? How do or would parties decide what should be made public in this fashion?